

REMARKS

In summary, claims, claims 1-6, 8, 10-17, 25 and 27-29 are pending. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-17, 25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 1, 10 and 25 are herein amended to better place the application in condition for allowance or appeal. No new claims are added. Support for amendments can be found at least in paragraphs 0056 and 0057 or the as-filed application.

Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Examiner Rivas is thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on July 21, 2010. Claimed subject matter was discussed. Asserted art was discussed. Claim amendments to better place the application in condition for allowance were discussed.

Claim Amendments

In view of the above-mentioned telephone conversation, independent claims 1, 10, and 25 are amended to indicate that a predictive pattern model is determined by running a pre-judged set of results through a search mechanism, applying a candidate predictive pattern to context-based user behavior data for the pre-judged set of results, comparing resulting predicted user satisfaction data with judged satisfaction for the pre-judged set of results, and if the candidate predictive pattern is successful at determining a predicted user satisfaction corresponding to the pre-judged user satisfaction, selecting the candidate predictive pattern as a predictive pattern model.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-17, 25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent application publication no. 2002/0152190, in the name of Biebesheimer *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Biebesheimer”). The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully traversed.

Biebesheimer neither discloses nor suggests the claimed subject matter. For example, Biebesheimer neither discloses nor suggests determining a predictive pattern model by “running a pre-judged set of results through the search mechanism; applying a candidate predictive pattern to context-based user behavior data for the pre-judged set of results; comparing resulting predicted user satisfaction data with judged satisfaction for the pre-judged set of results; and if the candidate predictive pattern is successful at determining a predicted user satisfaction corresponding to the pre-judged user satisfaction, selecting the candidate predictive pattern as one of the at least one predictive pattern model” as recited in amended independent claims 1, 10, and 25.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2826/306403.01
Application No.: 10/806,271
Office Action Dated: February 17, 2010

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance.

Date: August 14, 2010

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439